arXiv:1407.6942v1 [math.AP] 25 Jul 2014

Limits of the Stokes and Navier–Stokes equations in a punctured periodic domain

Michel Chipot[a], Gabriela Planas[b], James C. Robinson[c], Wei Xue[a]

[a]*Institut für Mathematik, Angewandte Mathematik, Winterthurerstrasse 190, CH-8057 Zürich. Switzerland*

[b]*Departamento de Matemática, Instituto de Matemática, Estatística e Computação Científica, Universidade Estadual de Campinas, Rua Sergio Buarque de Holanda 651, 13083-859 Campinas, SP. Brasil*

[c]*Mathematics Institute, University of Warwick, Coventry, CV4 7AL. U.K.*

Abstract

In this paper we treat three problems on a two-dimensional 'punctured periodic domain': we take $\Omega_r = (-L, L)^2 \setminus D_r$, where $D_r = B(0, r)$ is the disc of radius r centred at the origin. We impose periodic boundary conditions on the boundary of the box $\Omega = (-L, L)^2$, and Dirichlet boundary conditions on the circumference of the disc. In this setting we consider the Poisson equation, the Stokes equations, and the time-dependent Navier–Stokes equations, all with a fixed forcing function f (which must satisfy $\int_\Omega f = 0$ for the stationary problems), and examine the behaviour of solutions as $r \to 0$. In all three cases we show convergence of the solutions to those of the limiting problem, i.e. the problem posed on all of Ω with periodic boundary conditions.

Email addresses: m.m.chipot@math.uzh.ch (Michel Chipot), gplanas@ime.unicamp.br (Gabriela Planas), j.c.robinson@warwick.ac.uk (James C. Robinson), wei.xue@math.uzh.ch (Wei Xue)

1. Introduction

The study of fluid flow around an obstacle is a challenging and interesting problem in fluid mechanics, and has been the subject of much experimental and numerical investigation (see, among others, [1, 4, 7, 8, 18, 22, 25, 26]).

The mathematical analysis of the influence of an obstacle on the behaviour of the flow when the size of the obstacle is small when compared to that of the reference spatial scale has recently received increased attention. The case of a single obstacle in a two-dimensional ideal flow was analysed by Iftimie, Lopes Filho, & Nussenzveig Lopes [10]; then Iftimie et al. [11] and Iftimie & Kelliher [9] considered the viscous case, Lopes Filho [16] treated bounded domains with several holes, Lacave [13, 14] considered obstacles that shrink to a curve, and moving obstacles were treated by Dahsti & Robinson [3] and Silvestre & Takahashi [21]. For problems in exterior domains (i.e. extending to infinity) the flow is usually assumed to vanish at infinity, although the case of flows constant at infinity has been recently considered by Lopes Filho, Nguyen, & Nussenzveig Lopes [17]. A related 'small body' problem was considered by Robinson [20], who treated a simplified model of combustion in which physical particles were replaced by diffuse but compact regions of influence in the flow.

Here we are interested in the vanishing obstacle problem in a 2D periodic domain with a particularly simple geometry. More precisely, we are concerned with periodic flows on the punctured domain

$$\Omega_r = (-L, L)^2 \setminus D_r, \ L > 0,$$

where $D_r = B(0, r)$ is the disc of radius r centred at the origin, and we study the behaviour of the solutions of various models when the radius r of the disc tends to zero. Throughout the paper we refer to the excised disc D_r as the 'obstacle' in keeping with the ultimate application to problems of fluid flow.

First we consider the Poisson equation as a model problem, prior to treating to stationary Stokes and time-dependent Navier–Stokes problems, which have the added component of incompressibility. Thus our initial aim (in Section 2) will be to determine the asymptotic behaviour of the solution of the following problem when $r \to 0$:

$$-\Delta u_r = f \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \qquad u_r \text{ periodic}, \qquad u_r = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r. \tag{1.1}$$

While this problem has a solution for any $f \in L^2(\Omega_r)$, the limiting problem,

$$-\Delta u = f \ \text{ in } \Omega, \qquad u \text{ periodic},$$

only has a solution when

$$\int_\Omega f = 0. \tag{1.2}$$

We will show that when (1.2) holds then the solutions of (1.1) are uniformly bounded in r in the sense that

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 + \int_{\Omega_r} \left| u_r - \fint_\Omega u_r \right|^2$$

is uniformly bounded, where $\fint_\Omega u = |\Omega|^{-1} \int_\Omega u$ denotes the average of u over Ω (note that this is the whole domain and not just Ω_r). This is enough to show that

$$u_r - \fint_\Omega u_r \to u$$

in $H^1(\Omega)$ and that u satisfies the limiting equation. If (1.2) does not hold then the limiting problem has no solution, and in this case it follows that $\|u_r\|_{H^1}$ is unbounded as $r \to 0$.

We remark here, and will return to this later, that we have been unable to obtain a uniform bound on $\fint_\Omega u_r$, since the constant in the Poincaré inequality available on Ω_r degrades as $r \to 0$ (see Lemma 2.2).

In Section 3 we obtain similar results for the Stokes problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta \mathbf{u}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f} \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \\ \text{div } \mathbf{u}_r = 0, \\ \mathbf{u}_r \text{ periodic}, \\ \mathbf{u}_r = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r. \end{cases}$$

The main change from the case of the pure Laplacian is that we now have to deal with divergence-free vector-valued functions. The key technical result that allows us to do this is a method for approximating divergence-free periodic functions defined on the whole of Ω by a sequence of divergence-free functions that satisfy the zero boundary condition on D_r (Lemma 3.3). Once again, we require that $\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} = 0$. As before, we can find uniform estimates

sufficient to show that $\mathbf{u}_r - \fint_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r$ converges to a solution of the limiting problem, but we are unable to bound the average of $\mathbf{u}_r$ over Ω.

It would seem that the next natural step would be to consider the stationary Navier–Stokes equations in Ω_r,

$$-\Delta \mathbf{u}_r + (\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f}, \qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u}_r = 0. \tag{1.3}$$

However, while in the linear problems considered so far bounds on $\mathbf{u}_r - \fint_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r$ were sufficient to pass to the limit, this is not the case here. Informally, if we set $\langle \mathbf{u}_r \rangle = \fint_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r$ and consider the equation for $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r = \mathbf{u}_r - \langle \mathbf{u}_r \rangle$ then we obtain

$$-\Delta \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r + (\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r \cdot \nabla)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r - (\langle \mathbf{u}_r \rangle \cdot \nabla)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f},$$

which contains the additional term $-(\langle \mathbf{u}_r \rangle \cdot \nabla)\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r$. A uniform bound on $\langle \mathbf{u}_r \rangle$ would enable us to pass to the limit in this term, but we do not currently have such a bound.

An additional factor that makes this problem different in character from the others we consider here is that there is no known general uniqueness result for solutions of (1.3), even on the entire periodic domain. As such, it is perhaps more natural to consider a perturbation problem (given a solution of the equation on Ω, investigate the existence of nearby solutions for r small) than as a limiting problem; or to treat a restricted setting in which uniqueness results are available (when $\mathbf{f}$ is small in an appropriate sense). For more discussion of this stationary problem we refer to the classical work of Ladyzhenskaya [15] and Temam [23, 24].

We therefore instead turn in Section 4 to the time-dependent Navier–Stokes problem, which turns out to be more straightforward and for which we do not require the use of the Poincaré inequality, since a bound on the $\mathbb{L}^2$ norm follows immediately from the energy inequality. In this case we obtain convergence of $\mathbf{u}_r$ to the solution $\mathbf{u}$ of the periodic Navier–Stokes equations,

$$\mathbf{u}_t - \Delta \mathbf{u} + (\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u} + \nabla p = \mathbf{f}, \qquad \nabla \cdot \mathbf{u} = 0,$$

where the convergence is strong in $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega))$ and weak in $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega))$. We note that this falls short of $\mathbb{L}^\infty$ convergence of the velocity field; this is unsurprising since uniform convergence coupled with the fact that $\mathbf{u}_r = 0$ on ∂D_r would imply that the limiting flow was stationary at the origin.

2. Poisson equation

In this section we discuss the asymptotic behaviour of weak solutions for the Poisson problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta u_r = f \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \\ u_r \text{ periodic}, \\ u_r = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r. \end{cases}$$

Let us introduce some notation. Set $\Omega_0 = (-L, L)^2 = \Omega$ and define the function spaces

$$H^1_{\rm per} = \{v \in H^1(\Omega) : \text{ periodic}\}$$

and, for $r > 0$,

$$H^1_{\rm per}(\Omega_r) = \text{ the closure of } C^1_{\rm per}(\overline{\Omega}_r) \text{ in } H^1(\Omega_r)$$

and

$$V_{0,r} = \{v \in H^1_{\rm per}(\Omega_r) : \ v = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r\}.$$

Note that any function in $V_{0,r}$ can be extended by zero inside D_r to give a function in $H^1_{\rm per}$; this observation is fundamental to our analysis.

The vanishing obstacle problem for the Poisson equation

$$-\Delta u_r = f \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \qquad u_r \in V_{0,r}, \tag{2.1}$$

consists in determining the asymptotic behaviour of the solution u_r when r tends to 0.

The precise statement of our first convergence result is as follows.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $f \in L^2(\Omega)$. For every $r > 0$ there exists a unique solution $u_r \in V_{0,r}$ of the problem*

$$\int_{\Omega_r} \nabla u_r \cdot \nabla v = \int_{\Omega_r} fv \qquad \textit{for all } v \in V_{0,r}. \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover

a) if $\int_\Omega f = 0$ *then as* $r \to 0$

$$u_r - \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega u_r \to u_0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \nabla u_r \to \nabla u_0,$$

where the limits are taken in $L^2(\Omega)$ *and* $u_0 \in H^1_{\mathrm{per}}$ *is the unique solution of the problem*

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_0 \cdot \nabla v = \int_\Omega f v \qquad \textit{for all } v \in H^1_{\mathrm{per}} \tag{2.3}$$

that satisfies $\int_\Omega u_0 = 0$.

b) If $\int_\Omega f \neq 0$ *then* $\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2}$ *is unbounded as* $r \to 0$.

A few comments are in order.

Note that one can use $v = 1$ as a test function in (2.3), from which it follows immediately that there can be no solution of the limiting problem unless

$$\int_\Omega f = 0.$$

Observe that we do not have convergence of u_r itself in $L^2(\Omega)$. The main reason for this is that the constant in the Poincaré inequality for the punctured domain Ω_r degrades as $r \to 0$. We first recall the classical Poincaré inequality: there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $v \in H^1_{\mathrm{per}}$

$$\left\| v - \fint v \right\|_{L^2(\Omega)} \leq C \|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega)}, \tag{2.4}$$

where

$$\fint v = \frac{1}{|\Omega|}\int_\Omega v.$$

Notice that inequality (2.4) is still valid for functions in $v \in V_{0,r}$, and in particular the constant does not depend on r. However, without subtraction of the average we have only the following estimate.

Lemma 2.2. *Let* $r < (2-\sqrt{2})L$. *Then for all* $v \in V_{0,r}$

$$\|v\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \leq c(-\log r)\|\nabla v\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)}.$$

Proof. We assume that $v \in C^1_{\rm per}(\Omega_r)$ with $v = 0$ on ∂D_r, with the result for $v \in V_{0,r}$ obtained by a density argument. We extend v periodically outside Ω_r, the assumption that $r < (2-\sqrt{2})L$ meaning that any x with $|x| \le \sqrt{2}L$ in the extended domain does not lie within one of the additional 'holes', see Figure 1.



Figure 1: Periodic extension of the domain Ω_r used in the proof of Lemma 2.2

At $x = \rho\hat{x}$ (where $\hat{x} = x/|x|$), we can write

$$v(x) = v(\rho\hat{x}) - v(r\hat{x}) = \int_r^\rho \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}s} v(s\hat{x})\,\mathrm{d}s \le \int_r^\rho |\nabla v(s\hat{x})|\,\mathrm{d}s.$$

Then, since $B(0,\sqrt{2}L) \supset \Omega_r$, setting $R = \sqrt{2}L$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{\Omega_r} |v(x)|^2 &\le \int_0^{2\pi}\int_r^R \rho |v(\rho\hat{x})|^2\,\mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\le \int_0^{2\pi}\int_r^R \rho \left(\int_r^\rho |\nabla v(s\hat{x})|\,\mathrm{d}s\right)^2 \mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\le \int_0^{2\pi}\int_r^R \rho \left(\int_r^\rho s^{-1}\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\left(\int_r^\rho s|\nabla v(s\hat{x})|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\le \int_0^{2\pi}\int_r^R \rho\log(\rho/r)\left(\int_r^\rho s|\nabla v(s\hat{x})|^2\,\mathrm{d}s\right)\mathrm{d}\rho\,\mathrm{d}\theta \\
&\le \left(\int_r^R \rho\log(\rho/r)\,\mathrm{d}\rho\right)\left(\int_{B(0,R)} |\nabla v|^2\,\mathrm{d}x\right), \\
&\le c(-\log r)\|\nabla v\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_r)},
\end{aligned}$$

using the fact that $\int_{B(0,R)} |\nabla u|^2 \leq 2 \int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u|^2$ since we have extended u periodically outside Ω_r. $\square$

We note that the fact that the constant in Lemma 2.2 is not independent of r is not merely an artefact of our method of proof: while it may be possible to improve the dependence on r, one cannot remove it. Indeed, consider the family of functions u_r defined on Ω_r by

$$u_r(x) = \log(1 + \log(\rho/r))$$

where ρ is distance of x from the origin. This defines a function in $V_{0,r}$, since its values on the boundary of Ω agree on opposite faces.

Now, certainly

$$\begin{aligned}
\|u_r\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \geq \int_{r\leq|x|\leq L} |u_r(x)|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_r^L \rho(\log(1 + \log(\rho/r)))^2 \,\mathrm{d}\rho \\
&= r^2 \int_1^{L/r} s(\log(1 + \log(s))^2 \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\geq r^2 \int_{L/2r}^{L/r} s(\log(1 + \log s))^2 \,\mathrm{d}s \\
&\geq r^2 (L/2r)^2 \log(1 + \log(L/2r))^2 \\
&= \frac{L^2}{4} \log(1 + \log(L/2r))^2,
\end{aligned}$$

which is unbounded as $r \to 0$. However,

$$\partial_\rho u_r = \frac{1}{1 + \log(\rho/r)} \frac{1}{\rho}$$

and so

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \leq \int_{r\leq|x|\leq\sqrt{2}L} |\partial_\rho u_r|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x &= \int_r^{\sqrt{2}L} \frac{1}{(1 + \log(\rho/r))^2} \frac{1}{\rho} \,\mathrm{d}\rho \\
&\leq \int_1^\infty \frac{1}{s(1 + \log s)^2} \,\mathrm{d}s < \infty.
\end{aligned}$$

We now state a preliminary lemma on approximation of functions in H^1_{per} by functions in $V_{0,r}$ which will be used to pass to the limit.

Lemma 2.3. *Given $v \in H^1_{\text{per}}$ there exists a sequence $v_\epsilon \in V_{0,\epsilon}$ such that*

$$v_\epsilon \rightharpoonup v \quad \textit{in} \quad H^1(\Omega) \qquad \textit{as} \qquad \epsilon \to 0.$$

Proof. We first assume that $v \in H^1_{\text{per}} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$. Let

$$\phi_\epsilon = \min(1, \epsilon^{-1}\text{dist}(x, D_\epsilon)).$$

Observe that $\phi_\epsilon = 0$ for $x \in D_\epsilon$, $\phi_\epsilon = 1$ when $\text{dist}(x, D_\epsilon) \geq \epsilon$, and $|\nabla \phi_\epsilon| = 1/\epsilon$ for $0 < \text{dist}(x, D_\epsilon) < \epsilon$. It follows that $v\phi_\epsilon \in V_{0,\epsilon}$ with

$$|v\phi_\epsilon|^2 \leq |v|^2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} |\nabla(v\phi_\epsilon)|^2 &= |v\nabla\phi_\epsilon + \phi_\epsilon \nabla v|^2 \\ &\leq 2|v|^2|\nabla\phi_\epsilon|^2 + 2|\nabla v|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Since v is bounded and

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \phi_\epsilon|^2 = \int_{D_{2\epsilon}\setminus D_\epsilon} \epsilon^{-2} = 3\pi,$$

it follows that $v\phi_\epsilon$ is bounded in $H^1(\Omega)$. So we can extract a subsequence that converges weakly to a function ω in $H^1(\Omega)$. Since $v\phi_\epsilon \to v$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ we conclude that $\omega = v$.

Finally, given $v \in H^1_{\text{per}}$, note that $v_n = \max(-n, \min(v, n)) \in H^1_{\text{per}} \cap L^\infty(\Omega)$ converges to v in $H^1(\Omega)$ as $n \to \infty$. This allows us to deduce the existence of the required sequence using a diagonal argument. □

We remark that we have shown that $\cup_{\epsilon>0} V_{0,\epsilon}$ is dense in H^1_{per} in the weak topology. But $\cup_{\epsilon>0} V_{0,\epsilon}$ is a convex set (in fact a vector space) and thus the weak closure is equal to the strong closure and hence $\cup_{\epsilon>0} V_{0,\epsilon}$ is dense in H^1_{per} for the strong topology.

We are now in a position to prove our first convergence result.

Proof (Theorem 2.1). For fixed $r > 0$, the existence and uniqueness of u_r follow from the Lax–Milgram Lemma and Lemma 2.2.

We consider the cases when $\int_\Omega f = 0$ and $\int_\Omega f \neq 0$ separately.

a) Assume that $\int_\Omega f = 0$. We first obtain an estimate for the solution u_r. By taking $v = u_r$ in (2.2) and using the Poincaré inequality (2.4) one has

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2}^2 = \int_\Omega |\nabla u_r|^2 &= \int_\Omega f u_r \\ &= \int_\Omega f \left(u_r - \fint u_r \right) \\ &\leq \|f\|_{L^2} \left\| u_r - \fint u_r \right\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2} \|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2},\end{aligned}$$

from which it follows that

$$\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2}, \tag{2.5}$$

with a constant $C > 0$ independent on r.

Next, define

$$\tilde{u}_r = u_r - \fint u_r.$$

Then from the bound (2.5) and the Poincaré inequality (2.4), $\|\tilde{u}_r\|_{H^1(\Omega_r)}$ is uniformly bounded.

It follows that, up to the extraction of a subsequence, $\nabla u_r = \nabla \tilde{u}_r \rightharpoonup \nabla u_0$ and $\tilde{u}_r \to u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Note that

$$\int_\Omega u_0 = \lim_{r \to 0} \int_\Omega \tilde{u}_r = \lim_{r \to 0} \int_\Omega \left(u_r - \fint u_r \right) = 0. \tag{2.6}$$

Now, we pass to the limit in the weak formulation (2.2). Fix $r_0 > 0$ and observe that for $r < r_0$ one has $V_{0,r_0} \subset V_{0,r}$. Thus,

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_r \cdot \nabla v = \int_\Omega f v \qquad \text{for all } v \in V_{0,r_0}.$$

The weak convergence of ∇u_r to ∇u_0 in L^2 allows us to pass to the limit and obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_0 \cdot \nabla v = \int_\Omega f v \qquad \text{for all } v \in V_{0,r_0}. \tag{2.7}$$

From Lemma 3.3, given $v \in H^1_{\text{per}}$ there exists a sequence of test functions $v_\epsilon \in V_{0,\epsilon}$ such that $v_\epsilon \rightharpoonup v$ in $H^1(\Omega)$. Thus, for $\epsilon \leq r_0$, one has

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_0 \cdot \nabla v_\epsilon = \int_\Omega f v_\epsilon.$$

Passing to the limit as $\epsilon \to 0$, it follows that

$$\int_\Omega \nabla u_0 \cdot \nabla v = \int_\Omega f v \qquad \text{for all } v \in H^1_{\text{per}},$$

as claimed.

Since the limiting problem has a unique solution when one imposes the zero average condition, it follows that all convergent subsequences must have the same limit. As a consequence, the original sequence converges without the need to extract a subsequence.

It remains to show that in fact $\nabla u_r \to \nabla u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$ as $r \to 0$. To this end we show that $\|\nabla u_r\|^2_{L^2} \to \|\nabla u_0\|^2_{L^2}$. Since $u_r - \fint u_r \to u_0$ in $L^2(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 = \int_{\Omega_r} f u_r = \int_\Omega f u_r = \int_\Omega f \left(u_r - \fint u_r \right) \to \int_\Omega f u_0.$$

However, from (2.3) we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^2 = \int_\Omega f u_0,$$

which implies that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla u_r|^2 \to \int_\Omega |\nabla u_0|^2.$$

Coupled with weak convergence this norm convergence implies strong convergence of ∇u_r to ∇u_0 in $L^2(\Omega)$.

b) Assume that $\int_\Omega f \neq 0$. We note here that if $\int_\Omega f \neq 0$ and one assumes a uniform bound on $\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2}$, then one can follow the above argument (apart from obtaining the zero average condition (2.6)) to show that there is a solution of the limiting problem. But as remarked after the statement of Theorem 2.1, there can be no such solution. It follows that in this case $\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2}$ cannot be uniformly bounded as $r \to 0$. □

We note that in fact $\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2}$ increases as r decreases. Indeed, note that if $r' < r$ then $V_{0,r} \subset V_{0,r'}$. So we can take $v = u_r$ in both formulations

$$\int_{\Omega_r} \nabla u_r \cdot \nabla v = \int_{\Omega_r} fv \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_{r'}} \nabla u_{r'} \cdot \nabla v = \int_{\Omega_{r'}} fv$$

to obtain

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 = \int_{\Omega_r} f u_r \quad \text{and} \quad \int_{\Omega_{r'}} \nabla u_{r'} \cdot \nabla u_r = \int_{\Omega_{r'}} f u_r = \int_{\Omega_r} f u_r.$$

Thus

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla u_r|^2 = \int_{\Omega_{r'}} \nabla u_{r'} \cdot \nabla u_r$$

whence

$$\|\nabla u_r\|^2_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \leq \|\nabla u_{r'}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{r'})} \|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)},$$

i.e.

$$\|\nabla u_r\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \leq \|\nabla u_{r'}\|_{L^2(\Omega_{r'})}.$$

2.1. Failure of 'uniform elliptic regularity'

We now make the following observation, based on our convergence result, which strongly indicates the possibility that there may be no elliptic estimate for second derivatives in this punctured Laplace problem.

Indeed, suppose that there exists a constant $C > 0$, independent of r, such that any solution of

$$-\Delta u_r = f, \qquad u_r|_{\partial D_r} = 0,$$

satisfies

$$\|D^2 u_r\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)} \leq C \|f\|_{L^2(\Omega_r)}.$$

Were this the case, interpolation would imply that u_r is continuous on Ω, and that

$$u_r - \fint_\Omega u_r \to u_0 \qquad \text{uniformly on } \Omega;$$

in particular, since $u_r = 0$ on ∂D_r, we would have

$$u_0(0) = \lim_{r \to 0} \fint_\Omega u_r.$$

In other words, a uniform elliptic estimate would imply a uniform estimate on $\fint_\Omega u_r$, and we have not been able to obtain such an estimate.

While this is not a proof that such a uniform elliptic estimate is impossible, we now give an explicit example in a slightly different geometry for which uniform elliptic regularity definitely fails. We consider the same problem in an annulus ('punctured disc')

$$\Omega_r = B(0,2) \setminus B(0,\epsilon),$$

with Dirichlet conditions on the inner and outer boundary. We solve the Poisson equation in plane polar co-ordinates for radially symmetric solutions, using $'$ for $\mathrm{d}/\mathrm{d}r$:

$$\frac{1}{r}(ru')' = f(r) \qquad u(\epsilon) = 0, \qquad u(2) = 0.$$

We take $f = 1 - (3r/4)$ so that $\int_\Omega f \,\mathrm{d}x = \int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^2 rf(r)\,\mathrm{d}r\,\mathrm{d}\theta = 0$.

Then

$$(ru')' = r - \frac{3r^2}{4} \qquad \Rightarrow \qquad ru'(r) = \frac{r^2}{2} - \frac{r^3}{4} + C$$

and so

$$u'(r) = \frac{r}{2} - \frac{r^2}{4} + \frac{C}{r}.$$

Integrating again we obtain

$$u(r) = \frac{r^2}{4} - \frac{r^3}{12} - \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} + \frac{\epsilon^3}{12} + C\log(r/\epsilon),$$

and the boundary condition at $r = 2$ implies that

$$C = \frac{1}{\log(2/\epsilon)}\left[-\frac{1}{3} + \frac{\epsilon^2}{4} - \frac{\epsilon^3}{12}\right].$$

Rewrite the governing equation as

$$u'' + \frac{1}{r}u' = f.$$

Then $\|u''\|_{L^2}$ is bounded by $\|f\|_{L^2} + \|r^{-1}u'\|_{L^2}$. So consider

$$\frac{u'(r)}{r} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{r}{2} - \frac{C}{r^2}.$$

As the first two terms are in L^2, we need only consider the final term. Noting that

$$\|r^{-1}u'\|_{L^2}^2 = 2\pi C^2 \int_\epsilon^2 r(r^{-1}u')^2 \sim 2\pi C^2 \int_\epsilon^2 \frac{1}{r^3} \sim C^2\epsilon^{-2},$$

so $\|u\|_{\dot{H}^2} \sim \epsilon^{-1}(-\log\epsilon)^{-1}$ with log corrections.

One can find a similar example in the three-dimensional case, namely $f(r) = 1 - 5r^2/3$ on the spherical shell between $r = \epsilon$ and $r = 1$.

The lack of such a bound unfortunately appears to invalidate the arguments treating a moving disc in [3] and a moving sphere in [21].

3. The Stokes equations

In this section we extend the results of the previous section to the Stokes problem

$$-\Delta \mathbf{u}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f} \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \qquad \mathbf{u}_r|_{\partial D_r} = 0, \qquad \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_r = 0.$$

First we introduce the required spaces of vector fields. Given any space of scalar functions X we write $\mathbb{X}$ for the two-component space $X \times X$. Define for $r \geq 0$

$$\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\Omega_r) = \text{ the closure of } \mathbb{C}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\overline{\Omega}_r) \text{ in } \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega_r),$$
$$\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega_r) = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\Omega_r) : \ \operatorname{div}\mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_r\},$$
$$\mathbb{V}_{0,r} = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\Omega_r) : \ \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r\},$$

and

$$\mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma} = \{\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega_r) : \ \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ on } \partial D_r\}.$$

We observe that any function belonging to $\mathbb{V}_{0,r}$ or $\mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}$ can be extended by zero inside of D_r to give a function in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\Omega)$ or $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$, respectively.

We will determine the asymptotic behaviour of weak solutions to the following Stokes problem when $r \to 0$:

$$-\Delta \mathbf{u}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f} \ \text{ in } \Omega_r, \qquad \mathbf{u}_r \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}.$$

Our second convergence result is as follows. We use a colon in the left-hand side of (3.1) to denote summation in both indices,

$$\nabla \mathbf{u} : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} (\partial_i u_j)(\partial_i v_j).$$

Theorem 3.1. *Let $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$. For every $r > 0$ there exists a unique solution $\mathbf{u}_r \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}$ of the problem*

$$\int_{\Omega_r} \nabla \mathbf{u}_r : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \int_{\Omega_r} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \qquad \textit{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}. \tag{3.1}$$

Moreover

a) if $\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} = 0$ then as $r \to 0$

$$\mathbf{u}_r - \frac{1}{|\Omega|} \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u}_0 \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \nabla \mathbf{u}_r \to \nabla \mathbf{u}_0,$$

where the limits are taken in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{u}_0 \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ is the unique solution of the problem

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\mathbf{v} \qquad \textit{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega) \tag{3.2}$$

that satisfies $\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_0 = 0$;

b) if $\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \neq 0$ then $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{L}^2}$ is unbounded as $r \to 0$.

Note that if we set $\mathbf{v} = (1, 0)$ and $\mathbf{v} = (0, 1)$ as test functions in (3.2), then one can see immediately that for

$$\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \neq 0$$

a solution cannot exist.

The only difference from the Poisson problem is that we now have to approximate functions in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\text{per}}$ by functions in $\mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}$, i.e. we must incorporate the divergence-free condition. If we have such approximating functions then we can use the same argument as before to show convergence of solutions to those of the limiting problem. Indeed, the Poincaré inequalities work the same way as before and if $\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} = 0$ then

$$\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{L}^2} \leq C\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2},\ \forall r > 0,$$

where C is a constant independent of r.

To deal with the divergence-free issue, we consider the following divergence problem for $1 < p < \infty$, $g \in L^p(\Omega)$, and $\int_\Omega g = 0$:

$$\begin{cases} \operatorname{div} \mathbf{f} = g \quad \text{in } \Omega, \\ \mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega). \end{cases} \tag{3.3}$$

When Ω is star-like with respect to every point of $D_R(x_0)$ with $\overline{D}_R(x_0) \subset \Omega$, the existence of a solution $\mathbf{f}$ of this problem is proved in [6, Lem. III.3.1] together with the inequality

$$\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)} \leq C\|g\|_{L^p(\Omega)},$$

where the constant C depends on p, R and the diameter of Ω. Note that the divergence problem does not have a unique solution, since by adding any divergence-free function that vanishes on the boundary to the function $\mathbf{f}$ one would get another solution. Nevertheless, for more general bounded domains, for instance, those satisfying the cone condition, the following result is true (cf. [6, Thm III.3.1, Rmk. III.3.1]).

Theorem 3.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^2$ such that $\Omega = \cup_{j=1}^n U_j$, where each U_j is star-shaped with respect to some open ball B_j with $\overline{B_j} \subset \Omega_j$. Then, given $g \in L^q(\Omega) \cap L^k(\Omega)$, $1 < p, k < \infty$, with $\int_\Omega g = 0$, there exists at least one solution $\mathbf{f} \in \mathbb{W}^{1,q}_0(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{W}^{1,k}_0(\Omega)$ to the divergence problem (3.3) satisfying*

$$\|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,q}_0(\Omega)} \leq C_q^* C_q \|g\|_{L^q(\Omega)} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \|\mathbf{f}\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,k}_0(\Omega)} \leq C_k^* C_k \|g\|_{L^k(\Omega)},$$

where C_q and C_k depend on q,k respectively and the diameter of Ω and the smallest radius of the balls B_j. The constant C_q^* is the maximum of

$$C_1 = \left(1 + \frac{|U_1|^{1-1/q}}{|F_1|^{1-1/q}}\right)$$

and

$$C_k = \left(1 + \frac{|U_k|^{1-1/q}}{|F_k|^{1-1/q}}\right) \prod_{i=1}^{k-1} (1 + |F_i|^{1/q-1} |D_i \setminus U_i|^{1-1/q}), \qquad k \geq 2,$$

where $D_i = \cup_{s=i+1}^{n} U_s$ and $F_i = U_i \cap D_i$.

We are going to apply this theorem to the domain Ω_ε, see Figure 2. In this case, it is not difficult to see that the constant in the inequalities can be bounded independently of ε, as follows. For some $\varepsilon > 0$ consider the domain Ω_ε. U_0 denotes the part enclosed by the dashed lines in the picture, which is a part of the covering. When we perform rotations of $\frac{\pi}{2}$, π, $\frac{3\pi}{2}$ of U_0 we obtain a covering of Ω_ε by U_0, U_1, U_2, U_3. As ε decreases the triangle S_0 increases and we can put a fixed ball in S_0 for all smaller ε, such that U_0 is star-like with respect to this ball (we can do the same in each U_i). Moreover, we can easily see that $|F_{01}| = |U_0 \cap U_1|$ can be bounded from below. Therefore, we see that the constants in Theorem 3.2 can be bounded independently of ε, as claimed.

We now prove the required lemma on the approximation of functions in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ by functions in $\mathbb{V}_{0,\varepsilon,\sigma}$.

Lemma 3.3. *If $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ then there exists a sequence $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\varepsilon,\sigma}$ such that*

$$\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v} \quad \textit{in} \quad \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) \qquad \textit{as} \qquad \varepsilon \to 0.$$

Proof. Let $\psi(x) \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with

$$\psi(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & x \in (-\infty, 1], \\ 1 & x \in [2, \infty). \end{cases}$$

Let $\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) = \mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x}, D_\varepsilon)$, $\mathbf{x} \in \Omega_\varepsilon$ and define $\phi_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) \equiv \psi(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}))$. Then $\phi_\varepsilon = 0$ for $\mathbf{x} \in D_\varepsilon$, $\phi_\varepsilon = 1$ when $\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{x}, D_\epsilon) \geq 2\varepsilon$, and $\|\nabla \phi_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)} \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon}$ for $0 < \rho_\varepsilon(\mathbf{x}) < 2\varepsilon$.



Figure 2: The constant in Theorem 3.2 can be taken to be bounded independently of ε.

We first assume that $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$. Then for ε small $\phi_\varepsilon \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\varepsilon}$. Since $\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}) = 0$ it follows

$$\mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}\phi_\varepsilon) = \nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}.$$

Moreover,

$$\int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v} = \int_{\Omega_\varepsilon} \mathrm{div}(\mathbf{v}\phi_\varepsilon) = 0.$$

Noting that also that $\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}$ belongs to $\mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$, it follows that it satisfies the conditions required by Theorem 3.2, and so the divergence problem

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{div}\, \mathbf{f}_\varepsilon = -\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v} & \text{in } \Omega_\varepsilon, \\ \mathbf{f}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega_\varepsilon), \end{cases}$$

has a solution $\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$, for any $1 < p < \infty$, satisfying

$$\|\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C \|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}\|_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)},$$

where C depends only on p and Ω.

Define $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon := \mathbf{f}_\varepsilon + \phi_\varepsilon \mathbf{v}$, so that $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\varepsilon,\sigma}$. We will show that $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$. To this end, observe that

$$\begin{aligned}\|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}\|^p_{L^p(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega |\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}|^p &= \int_{D_{2\varepsilon}\setminus D_\varepsilon} |\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}|^p \\ &\leq \|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}\|^p_{L^\infty(\Omega)} 3\pi\varepsilon^2 \\ &\leq \frac{C^p}{\varepsilon^p}\|\mathbf{v}\|^p_{\mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)} 3\pi\varepsilon^2 \qquad (3.4)\end{aligned}$$

where C is a constant independent of ε.

Therefore, for $1 < p < 2$, it follows that for some constant C

$$\|\nabla\phi_\varepsilon \cdot \mathbf{v}\|^p_{L^p(\Omega_\varepsilon)} \leq C\varepsilon^{2-p} \to 0$$

as $\varepsilon \to 0$. Hence, we deduce that $\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon$ converges to 0 in $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ for $1 < p < 2$.

Now, thanks to (3.4) $\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon$ is bounded in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega)$ and we can extract a subsequence that converges weakly to a limit function $\mathbf{f}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega)$. Since the limit is unique in the distribution sense and $\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon \to 0$ in $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ we have $\mathbf{f} = 0$ and $\mathbf{f}_\varepsilon \rightharpoonup 0$ in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega)$.

For every i and j

$$\partial_{x_i}(\phi_\varepsilon v_j) = \phi_\varepsilon \partial_{x_i} v_j + \partial_{x_i}\phi_\varepsilon v_j$$

and arguing as in (3.4) one sees that $\phi_\varepsilon \mathbf{v}$ is bounded in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$. Moreover, since $\phi_\varepsilon \mathbf{v} \to \mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$ it follows that $\phi_\varepsilon \mathbf{v} \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$. Hence, we have found a divergence-free sequence $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\varepsilon,\sigma}$ that converges weakly to $\mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$.

It remains only to prove that a function in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ can be approximated by functions in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$ which will allow us to conclude via a diagonal argument.

Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$. Then there exists a sequence in $\mathbf{w}_n \in \mathbb{C}^1_{\mathrm{per}}(\overline{\Omega})$ such that

$$\mathbf{w}_n \to \mathbf{v} \text{ in } \mathbb{H}^1(\Omega). \qquad (3.5)$$

Since $\mathbf{w}_n$ is periodic one has

$$\int_\Omega \mathrm{div}(\mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{v}) = \int_\Omega \mathrm{div}\, \mathbf{w}_n = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{v}) = \operatorname{div} \mathbf{w}_n \in L^p(\Omega) \quad \forall p \geq 2.$$

Thus, by Theorem 3.2 there exists an $\mathbf{f}_n \in \mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ that solves

$$\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{f}_n) = \operatorname{div}(\mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{v}) \text{ in } \Omega$$

and satisfies the estimates

$$\|\mathbf{f}_n\|_{\mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega)} \leq C \|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{v})\|_{L^2(\Omega)},$$
$$\|\mathbf{f}_n\|_{\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)} \leq C \|\operatorname{div}(\mathbf{w}_n)\|_{L^p(\Omega)} \text{ for some } p > 2.$$

From (3.5) and the first estimate above it follows that $\mathbf{f}_n \to 0$ in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(\Omega)$. The second estimate implies that $\mathbf{f}_n \in \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$, since $\mathbb{W}^{1,p}_0(\Omega)$ is embedded into $\mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$ for $p > 2$. Now if we set

$$\mathbf{v}_n = \mathbf{w}_n - \mathbf{f}_n,$$

then clearly $\mathbf{v}_n \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\text{per},\sigma}(\Omega) \cap \mathbb{L}^\infty(\Omega)$ and $\mathbf{v}_n \to \mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$. □

To prove Theorem 3.1 we essentially recapitulate the proof of Theorem 2.1 in this new setting.

Proof. (Theorem 3.1) Define

$$\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r = \mathbf{u}_r - \fint \mathbf{u}_r.$$

Then from the Poincaré inequality, $\|\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega_r)}$ is uniformly bounded. Therefore for a subsequence $\nabla \mathbf{u}_r = \nabla \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r \rightharpoonup \nabla \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_r \to \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$, where $\mathbf{u}_0$ satisfies $\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_0 = 0$.

For a fixed r_0, $\forall r < r_0$ one has $\mathbb{V}_{0,\sigma,r_0} \subset \mathbb{V}_{0,\sigma,r}$. Thus

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_r : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\sigma,r_0}.$$

Passing to the limit in r we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\sigma,r_0}. \tag{3.6}$$

Let $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ and let $\mathbf{v}_\varepsilon$ be the approximating sequence from Lemma 3.3. Then for $\varepsilon \le r_0$ we have

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 : \nabla \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v}_\varepsilon$$

and passing to the limit in ε we obtain

$$\int_\Omega \nabla \mathbf{u}_0 : \nabla \mathbf{v} = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \qquad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$$

as required. (This is (3.2).)

Since the limiting problem has a unique solution when one imposes the zero average condition, it follows that all convergent subsequences must have the same limit. As a consequence, the whole original sequence converges toward $\mathbf{u}_0$.

To see that $\nabla \mathbf{u}_r \to \nabla \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$ we show that $\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)} \to \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_0\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)}$. Since $\mathbf{u}_r - \fint \mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$,

$$\int_{\Omega_r} |\nabla \mathbf{u}_r|^2 = \int_{\Omega_r} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_r = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_r = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \left(\mathbf{u}_r - \fint \mathbf{u}_r \right) \to \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_0.$$

But from (3.2) we have

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \mathbf{u}_0|^2 = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{u}_0,$$

which implies that

$$\int_\Omega |\nabla \mathbf{u}_r|^2 \to \int_\Omega |\nabla \mathbf{u}_0|^2.$$

Coupled with weak convergence this implies strong convergence of $\nabla \mathbf{u}_r$ to $\nabla \mathbf{u}_0$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$. □

4. The time-dependent Navier–Stokes equations

In this section we tackle the vanishing obstacle problem for the Navier–Stokes equations. The corresponding problem in a two-dimensional exterior

domain (i.e. $\mathbb{R}^2 \setminus D_r$) was analysed in [11] with the initial condition for the velocity corresponding to a fixed initial vorticity (independent of r). Here, by considering a periodic domain and suitable initial data we provide a less technical proof by using arguments along the lines of the previous sections.

We consider weak solutions to the following Navier–Stokes problem

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \mathbf{u}_r - \Delta \mathbf{u}_r + (\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_r + \nabla p_r = \mathbf{f} \ \text{ in } \Omega_r \times (0,\infty), \\ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{u}_r = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_r \times (0,\infty), \\ \mathbf{u}_r = 0 \text{ in } \partial D_r \times (0,\infty), \\ \text{periodic}, \\ \mathbf{u}_r(0) = \mathbf{u}_r^0 \text{ in } \Omega_r, \end{cases} \tag{4.1}$$

and show that they converge to periodic solutions of the equations on Ω. Note that in this section we do not require that $\int_\Omega \mathbf{f} = 0$.

In the course of the proof we will require the following lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose that* $\mathbf{u}_n$ *is bounded in* $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega))$ *and converges to* $\mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega\setminus\{0\}))$. *Then* $\mathbf{u}_n$ *converges to* $\mathbf{u}$ *in* $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega))$.

Proof. Let $C > 0$ be such that $\|\mathbf{u}_n\|^2_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega))}$, $\|\mathbf{u}\|^2_{L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega))} \le C$. Given $\epsilon > 0$ we can take an open set $K_\epsilon \subset\subset \Omega\setminus\{0\}$ such that $|\Omega\setminus K_\epsilon| \le \frac{\epsilon^2}{8C^2}$. Now, there exists n_ϵ such that

$$\int_0^T \int_{K_\epsilon} |\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}|^2 \le \frac{\epsilon}{2} \qquad \text{for } n \ge n_\epsilon.$$

Thus, for $n \ge n_\epsilon$,

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \int_\Omega |\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}|^2 &= \int_0^T \int_{K_\epsilon} |\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}|^2 + \int_0^T \int_{\Omega\setminus K_\epsilon} |\mathbf{u}_n - \mathbf{u}|^2 \\ &\le \frac{\epsilon}{2} + |\Omega\setminus K_\epsilon|^{\frac{1}{2}} \int_0^T \Big(\int_\Omega (|\mathbf{u}_n|^4 + |\mathbf{u}|^4) \Big)^{\frac{1}{2}} \le \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now prove our convergence result for time-dependent Navier–Stokes solutions. We define

$$\mathbb{H}_{r,\sigma} = \{\mathbf{v}_r \in \mathbb{L}^2_{\mathrm{per}}(\Omega_r) : \ \operatorname{div} \mathbf{v} = 0 \text{ in } \Omega_r\}.$$

Theorem 4.2. *Let $T > 0$, $\mathbf{u}_r^0 \in \mathbb{H}_{r,\sigma}$ and $f \in \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega \times (0,T))$. For every $r > 0$ there exists a unique weak solution $\mathbf{u}_r$ of problem (4.1), i.e. a unique $\mathbf{u}_r \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{H}_{r,\sigma})$ with $\partial_t \mathbf{u}_r \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}'_{0,r_0,\sigma})$, such that*

$$\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_r, \mathbf{v}\rangle + \int_{\Omega_r} \nabla \mathbf{u}_r : \nabla \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Omega_r} [(\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_r] \cdot \mathbf{v} = \int_{\Omega_r} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \quad \textit{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}, \tag{4.2}$$

$$\mathbf{u}_r(0) = \mathbf{u}_r^0. \tag{4.3}$$

In addition, $\mathbf{u}_r$ satisfies the energy inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}_r(t)\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)} + \int_0^t \|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)} \le C(T)(\|\mathbf{u}_r^0\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)} + \int_0^t \|\mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)}). \tag{4.4}$$

Furthermore, if $\mathbf{u}_r^0 \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u}^0$ in $\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)$ as $r \to 0$, then

$$\mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u} \textit{ strongly in } \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega \times (0,T)) \textit{ and weakly in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)),$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the unique weak solution of the Navier–Stokes problem

$$\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\rangle + \int_{\Omega} \nabla \mathbf{u} : \nabla \mathbf{v} + \int_{\Omega} [(\mathbf{u} \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}] \cdot \mathbf{v} = \int_{\Omega} \mathbf{f} \cdot \mathbf{v} \textit{ for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega),$$
$$\mathbf{u}(0) = \mathbf{u}^0.$$

Proof. The proof of existence of weak solutions follows by using the Galerkin method and, since we are in dimension two, the uniqueness is also standard. The energy inequality, which follows formally from the differential inequality

$$\partial_t \|\mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)} + 2\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)} \le \|\mathbf{f}\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_r)}$$

using the Gronwall lemma, follows rigorously from the same limiting Galerkin procedure, with an energy inequality obtained for each approximation. (See Constantin & Foias [2], Galdi [5], or Robinson [19], for example.)

We split the proof of convergence into three steps. Briefly, we will obtain estimates for the solution $\mathbf{u}_r$ independent of r, show that $\mathbf{u}_r$ converges to a limit in various senses, and show this this is sufficient to pass to the limit in the weak formulation of the problem.

Step 1: Estimates. From the energy inequality (4.4) we already know that

$$\mathbf{u}_r \text{ is bounded in } L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)) \cap L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \tag{4.5}$$

uniformly for $r > 0$.

We need some strong convergence in order to pass to the limit in the nonlinear term. To this end we estimate the time derivative of $\mathbf{u}_r$ from (4.2). First observe that

$$\int_{\Omega_r} [(\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{u}_r] \cdot \mathbf{v} = -\int_{\Omega_r} [(\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}] \cdot \mathbf{u}_r, \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}.$$

Next, for a fixed r_0, $\forall r < r_0$ one has $\mathbb{V}_{0,r_0,\sigma} \subset \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}$. Thus, for any $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r_0,\sigma}$

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \partial_t \mathbf{u}_r, \mathbf{v}\rangle| &= \Big| \int_{\Omega_r} \nabla \mathbf{u}_r : \nabla \mathbf{v} - \int_{\Omega_r} [(\mathbf{u}_r \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{v}] \cdot \mathbf{u}_r + \int_{\Omega_r} \mathbf{f}\mathbf{v} \Big| \\ &\le C(\|\nabla \mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)} + \|\mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)} + \|f\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)}) \|\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used the interpolation inequality

$$\|\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)} \le C \|\mathbf{u}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)} \|\mathbf{u}\|^{\frac{1}{2}}_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}.$$

Then, by (4.5), we deduce that

$$\partial_t \mathbf{u}_r \text{ is bounded in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{V}'_{0,r_0,\sigma}) \tag{4.6}$$

uniformly for $r > 0$.

Step 2: Convergence. Observe that, for a fixed $r_0 > 0$, $\mathbf{u}_r$ is also bounded in $L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega_{r_0}))$ for any $r < r_0$. So, as $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega_{r_0}) \subset\subset \mathbb{L}^2(\Omega_{r_0}) \subset \mathbb{V}'_{0,r_0,\sigma}$, from (4.6) and the Aubin–Lions Lemma we conclude that, up to a subsequence,

$$\mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^2((0,T) \times \Omega_{r_0}).$$

By a diagonal argument we can find a subsequence of $\mathbf{u}_r$ such that

$$\mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2_{\mathrm{loc}}(\Omega \backslash \{0\})).$$

Hence, as $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)$, from (4.5) and Lemma 4.1 it follows that

$$\mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)).$$

Moreover, from (4.5),

$$\mathbf{u}_r \rightharpoonup \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)) \text{ and } \mathbf{u}_r \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega))$$

and, by interpolation and the Hölder inequality,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{u}\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)} &\le C\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)} \\ &\le C\Big(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r - \mathbf{u}\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we infer in addition that

$$\mathbf{u}_r \to \mathbf{u} \text{ in } L^2(0,T;\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)). \tag{4.7}$$

Step 3: Passage to the limit in the weak formulation. By using again that, for a fixed r_0, $\forall r < r_0$ one has $\mathbb{V}_{0,r_0,\sigma} \subset \mathbb{V}_{0,r,\sigma}$, multiplying (4.2) by $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$ and integrating in time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}-\int_0^T\int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi' + \int_0^T\int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u}_r : \nabla\mathbf{v}\xi - \int_0^T\int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}_r\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}_r\xi \\ = \int_0^T\int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi + \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}_r^0\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi(0)\end{aligned}$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r_0,\sigma}$ and $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$.

To show the convergence of nonlinear term, we re-write

$$\begin{aligned}\int_0^T\int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}_r\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}_r\xi - [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}\xi \\ = \int_0^T\int_\Omega [((\mathbf{u}_r-\mathbf{u})\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}_r\xi + [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot(\mathbf{u}_r-\mathbf{u})\xi.\end{aligned}$$

We prove that the first term on the right-hand side goes to zero; the convergence of the second term is proved similarly. By using the Hölder inequality in space and then in time, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Big|\int_0^T\int_\Omega [((\mathbf{u}_r-\mathbf{u})\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}_r\xi\Big| \\ &\le \int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r-\mathbf{u}\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)}\|\nabla\mathbf{v}\|_{\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega)}\|\mathbf{u}_r\|_{\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)}\|\xi\|_{L^\infty(0,T)} \\ &\le C\Big(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r-\mathbf{u}\|^2_{\mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}\Big(\int_0^T \|\mathbf{u}_r\|^2_{\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega)}\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where we have used the embedding $\mathbb{H}^1(\Omega) \subset \mathbb{L}^4(\Omega)$. The convergence follows from convergence (4.7) and estimate (4.5).

Passing to the limit in r we obtain

$$-\int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi' + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v}\xi - \int_0^T \int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}\xi = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi + \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}^0\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi(0)$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{V}_{0,r_0,\sigma}$ and $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$.

Next, we argue as in the Stokes problem by using the approximation from Lemma 3.3. Given $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ there exist $\mathbf{v}^\epsilon \in \mathbb{V}_{0,\epsilon,\sigma}$ such that $\mathbf{v}^\epsilon \rightharpoonup \mathbf{v}$ in $\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$. Thus, for $\epsilon \leq r_0$ one has

$$-\int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}^\epsilon\xi' + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v}^\epsilon\xi - \int_0^T \int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}^\epsilon]\cdot\mathbf{u}\xi = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}^\epsilon\xi + \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}^0\cdot\mathbf{v}^\epsilon\xi(0).$$

Passing to the limit in ϵ we get

$$-\int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi' + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v}\xi - \int_0^T \int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}\xi = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi + \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}^0\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi(0) \quad (4.8)$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ and $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$.

In particular, since $\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0,T;\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)) \cap L^\infty(0,T;\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega))$ we can take $\xi \in C_0^\infty(0,T)$ in (4.8) and deduce that $\partial_t\mathbf{u} \in L^2(0,T;(\mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega))')$, whence $\mathbf{u}$ satisfies

$$\langle \partial_t\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}\rangle + \int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v} + \int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{u}]\cdot\mathbf{v} = \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$.

It remains only to prove that $\mathbf{u}(0) = \mathbf{u}^0$. To see this, multiply the previous equality by $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$ and integrate in time, to obtain

$$-\int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi' + \int_0^T \int_\Omega \nabla\mathbf{u} : \nabla\mathbf{v}\xi - \int_0^T \int_\Omega [(\mathbf{u}\cdot\nabla)\mathbf{v}]\cdot\mathbf{u}\xi = \int_0^T \int_\Omega \mathbf{f}\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi + \int_\Omega \mathbf{u}(0)\cdot\mathbf{v}\xi(0)$$

for all $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{H}^1_{\mathrm{per},\sigma}(\Omega)$ and $\xi \in C_0^\infty[0,T)$. Comparing with (4.8) we conclude that $\mathbf{u}(0) = \mathbf{u}^0$. Notice also that $\mathbf{u} \in C([0,T];\mathbb{L}^2(\Omega))$.

Since the limiting problem has a unique solution, it follows that all convergent subsequences must have the same limit. As a consequence, the whole original sequence converges toward $\mathbf{u}$. □

5. Conclusions

We have analysed three models in a simple but unusual geometry, the 'punctured periodic domain', showing that the influence of the obstacle, a disc of radius r, evaporates in the limit as $r \to 0$.

Some interesting open problems remain. While the lack of a bound on the average of the solution u_r over Ω (in both the Poisson and Stokes problems) that is uniform in r appears initially to be only a mathematical curiosity, such a bound is central to tackling the stationary Navier–Stokes problem in this geometry.

The fact that there is no 'uniform elliptic regularity' for the Laplacian or Stokes operator in this geometry means that the important 'vanishing tracer' problem (cf. [3, 21]) also remains open. We plan to return to this is a future paper.

Acknowledgments

The research of MC and WX has received funding from Lithuanian–Swiss cooperation programme to reduce economic and social disparities within the enlarged European Union under project agreement No CH-3-SMM-01/0. It

was supported also by the Swiss National Science Foundation under the contract # 200021-146620. GP thanks the Mathematics Institute of the University of Warwick for their kind hospitality during her visit there. GP was partially supported by FAPESP, grant 2013/00048-3 and CNPq, grant 302865/2012-8, Brazil. JCR is supported by an EPSRC Leadership Fellowship EP/G007470/1, and would like to thank MC and WM for their hospitality in Zurich.

References

[1] P. D. Ariel. On computation of the three-dimensional flow past a stretching sheet. Appl. Math. Computat. 188 (2007), 1244-1250.

[2] P. Constantin and C. Foias. The Navier–Stokes equations. University of Chicago Press, 1988.

[3] M. Dashti and J. C. Robinson, The motion of a fluid-rigid disc system at the zero limit of the rigid disc radius, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. 200 (2011), no. 1, 285-312.

[4] J. D. Eldredge, Numerical simulation of the fluid dynamics of 2D rigid body motion with the vortex particle method, J. Comput. Phys. 221 (2007), 626-648.

[5] Galdi, G.P. An introduction to the Navier–Stokes initial-boundary value problem. Fundamental directions in mathematical fluid mechanics, 1–70, Adv. Math. Fluid Mech., Birkhäuser, Basel, 2000.

[6] Galdi, G. P., 2011, An Introduction to the Mathematical Theory of the Navier–Stokes Equations, second edition. Springer, New York.

[7] D. Homentcovschi. Three-dimensional Oseen flow past a flat plate. Q. Appl. Math. 40 (1982), 137-149.

[8] J. D. Hudson and S. C. R. Dennis. The flow of a viscous incompressible fluid past a normal flat plate at low and intermediate Reynolds numbers: the wake. J. Fluid Mech. 160 (1985), 369-383.

[9] D. Iftimie, J. Kelliher. Remarks on the vanishing obstacle limit for a 3D viscous incompressible fluid. Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 137 (2009), 685-694.

[10] D. Iftimie, M. C. Lopes Filho and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Two-dimensional incompressible ideal flow around a small obstacle. Commun. PDEs 28 (2003), 349-379.

[11] D. Iftimie, M. C. Lopes Filho and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Two-dimensional incompressible viscous flow around a small obstacle. Math. Annalen 336 (2006), 449-489.

[12] D. Iftimie, M. C. Lopes Filho and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Incompressible flow around a small obstacle and the vanishing viscosity limit. Commun. Math. Phys. 287 (2009), 99-115.

[13] C. Lacave. Two-dimensional incompressible ideal flow around a thin obstacle tending to a curve. Annales Inst. H. Poincare Analyse Non Lineaire 26 (2009), 1121-1148.

[14] C. Lacave, Two-dimensional incompressible viscous flow around a thin obstacle tending to a curve, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 139 (2009), no. 6, 1237-1254.

[15] O.A. Ladyzhenskaya, The mathematical theory of viscous incompressible flow. Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York-London 1963.

[16] M. C. Lopes Filho. Vortex dynamics in a two-dimensional domain with holes and the small obstacle limit. SIAM J. Math. Analysis 39 (2007), 422-436.

[17] M. C. Lopes Filho, H. H. Nguyen and H. J. Nussenzveig Lopes. Incompressible and ideal 2D flow around a small obstacle with constant velocity at infinity. Quart. Appl. Math. 71 (2013) 679-687.

[18] D. Pierce, Photographic evidence of the formation and growth of vorticity behind plates accelerated from rest in still air, J. Fluid Mech., 11 (1961), 460–464.

[19] J.C. Robinson, Infinite-dimensional dynamical systems. Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[20] J.C. Robinson, A coupled particle-continuum model: well-posedness and the limit of zero radius. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci. 460 (2004), 1311-1334.

[21] A. L. Silvestre, T. Takahashi. The Motion of a Fluid-Rigid Ball System at the Zero Limit of the Rigid Ball Radius. Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. 211 (2014) 991-1012.

[22] S. H. Smith. A note on the boundary layer approach to the impulsively started flow past a flat plate. J. Engng Math. 29 (1995), 195-202.

[23] R. Temam. Navier–Stokes equations. Theory and numerical analysis. Studies in Mathematics and its Applications, Vol. 2. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977.

[24] R. Temam. Navier–Stokes equations and nonlinear functional analysis. CBMS-NSF Regional Conference Series in Applied Mathematics, 41. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 1983.

[25] C. Turfus. Prandtl-Batchelor flow past a flat plate at normal incidence in a channel: inviscid analysis. J. Fluid Mech. 249 (1993), 59-72.

[26] L. Zannetti. Vortex equilibrium in flows past bluff bodies. J. Fluid Mech. 562 (2006), 151-171.